

SUNSHINE PERIOD

RECEIVED

02-277

From: Gerald Angelo
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Mon, Jun 2, 2003 1:34 AM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

JUN 17 2003

Gerald Angelo (gjangelo@yahoo.com) writes:

If raising the ownership cap supposedly eliminates competition, then consumers should have the benefit of CHOOSING their programming provider from a pool of various owners. DMAs should no longer be used to force sub-par affiliates upon consumers.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 141.156.213.62
Remote IP address: 141.156.213.62

From: Alex Logan
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 1:57 PM
Subject: Don't Do It

Commissioner Copps,
Please do not be the obvious sell-out that you appear to be. The interests of corporations are not the only interests in this country. Please realize that protecting our democracy and the freedom of information in this country is more important than the health and wealth of a few corporate entities.
Please vote NO on the proposed loosening of FCC regulations in your next meeting.

Alex Logan
1434 Essex Way #1
San Jose, CA 95117

From: Jim Malkoski
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 2:05 PM
Subject: free speech

To the Commissioners of the Federal Communications Commission:
Contrary to popular belief, there are free thinkers and intelligent individuals in this country who honor diversity in music and news (I am one). I am a firm believer in receiving the truth of some matters from diverse and honest sources. I am against just one voice controlling the broadcast media. Right now the only honest news I feel I get is from NPR and if the deregulation goes through, my friends and I plan to boycott the media. I would like you to vote against the deregulation of broadcast ownership rules.

Deregulation would allow just one view out of many to be publicized, which is unfair to the public. Mainstream news has become more and more like the propaganda of Nazi Germany, one-sided and aimed toward the less-intelligent masses, who are most likely to believe it and be influenced by it. Is this not supposed to be a country of free thinkers? Please support free speech and thought.

Sincerely,
Alexandra Malkoski

The new MSN 8: advanced junk mail protection and 2 months FREE*
<http://join.msn.com/?page=features/junkmail>

From: revkeyes
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 2:07 PM
Subject: <No Subject>

Dear Chairman Powell and Commissioners Abernathy, Copps, Martin and Adelstein:

Please do not further deregulate the broadcast marketplace. It is already hard enough to find responsible, varied reporting and commentary, culturally uplifting, unique programming, and anything resembling regional nuance and local accountability in our media. I urge you to refrain from making it any worse. Enough with the homogenization and narrowing of the nation's airwaves. The cultural and political implications for our country and world are already evident, and I am convinced the problem would only get worse with further deregulation. Surely the forced media silence regarding your recent tour and deliberations on this vital issue are more than evidence enough of the selfish, anti-democratic strategies of the few corporations that own such a large portion of our media outlets. Please stop the war on independent American voices!! We're selling out the freedom of the American people to the highest bidder!

Sincerely,

Rev. Corey S. Keyes
P.O. Box 74
West Bloomfield, NY 14585
(585) 624-7208
Revkeyes@rochester.rr.com

From: Just7ds@aol.com
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 2:46 PM
Subject: RE: FCC Changes

I resent this "SNEAK ATTACK" on my freedom by those whom I consider no better than "TERRORISTS" on the FCC Commission! I am demanding an investigation by Congress. Can a "PAY OFF" be involved? I am mad as hell and want this stopped! Diane Feinstein and others in Congress are hearing from me.
D.A. Sumares

From: meliflaw@lmi.net
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 2:51 PM
Subject: <No Subject>

Chairman Michael K. Powell
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Chairman Powell;

The proposed raising of the cap on media ownership would be quite destructive to the spirit of our democracy, and I urge you to oppose it, now and in future.

In fact, the present cap has already lead to levels of concentrated power that are an obvious danger to democratic government. The citizens of this country gain no economic or social benefit from a company such as Clear Channel owning so many stations in so many markets. Such concentration allows a few individuals to determine what opinions, what news, what music, and what forms of expression vast numbers of Americans can hear and see, and to deny access to any voice which does share their views and economic interests.

The usual reason I hear for changing the ownership limits is that the new technology has rendered these limits irrelevant. However most people still get their information from broadcast and cable, only a minority from print and the Internet.

While satellite and Internet media will offer many new opportunities, they are intrinsically global in nature and are mostly capital intensive. Broadcast TV, broadcast radio, and newspapers are naturally local in nature, and radio is cheap to operate.

It is simply socially and economically healthier for these local media to be under local ownership.

Yours truly,

Melanie Lawrence
Oakland, California

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: Hugh Chatfield
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 2:53 PM
Subject: preserve a plurality of voices...

Dear Commissioner Copps,

Please do not allow a further consolidation of the media. Such a vote would dampen the varied opinions which represent democracy. Thank you very much.

Charles Hubert Chatfield

=====
Hugh Chatfield
88 Park Street, #21
Portland, ME 04101
tel:(207) 772 - 0272

Do you Yahoo!?
Yahoo! Calendar - Free online calendar with sync to Outlook(TM).
<http://calendar.yahoo.com>

From: Blanca E. DeGarr-Rizzi
To: KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 3:10 PM
Subject: Fw: Hold the FCC accountable to do its Regulation job

Subject: Fw: Hold the FCC accountable to do its Regulation job

Greetings Sir(s) and Madam(s),

Allow me to introduce myself to you in this electronic medium until we, hopefully someday, meet in person. I am Blanca E. Degarr-Rizzi. I hope this letter finds you in good health and spirits. My concerns are clearly outlined for you to consider as you make determinations affecting all Americans and, quite possibly, our attainment of information. Kindly read the letter/e-mail I sent to our fine President elect Commander-In-Chief, and accept these views from a truly concerned parent's point of view.

The American Public has to fully understand the magnitude of the decision the FCC plans to make on it's own, for us all. I recommend that the FCC sponsor a debate event, as it is considering removing the regulations established which help protect and preserve the livelihoods of many entertainment companies and folks working for them. Therefore, it would seem only fair and just to allow this debate to be publicized and allow the American Public to partake in the decision by voting on this matter affecting how our American Media's voice sounds today and tomorrow.

We have the right to know that this scheduled hearing on June 2nd, 2003, is fair. Folks, it is not fair until all America has ample opportunity to know that it exists, ample opportunity to evaluate the pros and cons and we have the right to take a vote on what We The People want the FCC to do about how our American Media functions. We vote on bills, we vote in elections, we certainly need to call for a vote on this matter.

Thank you all for your attention to this urgent matter.

Good Thoughts/Good Day

----- Original Message -----

From: Blanca E. DeGarr-Rizzi
To: president@whitehouse.gov
Sent: Thursday, May 29, 2003 2:36 PM
Subject: Hold the FCC accountable to do its Regulation job

Dearest Mr. President and First Lady,

I'm Blanca E. Degarr-Rizzi. I have you written several political poems expressing my views on attaining peace, my dedication as a full-time mother, my love for our fine country and my support of you and the choices you make as our government leader. So as your friend, I ask that you please consider the following issue I present to you today which stem from a major concern about how the media industry needs regulations in order to promote a healthy and diverse entertainment industry. But also are dear to me, as I have a personal investment affiliation for my friends and admire their passion and dedication to the endeavors which change the course of history for all people. I have this faith in you and I have this faith in Mr. Leonard Hill, of Len Hill Films, Los Angeles. In the late 80s, Mr. Hill produced the shortlived television series "Rags to Riches" on which I costarred along with Joseph Bologna, Tisha Campbell, Kimiko Gelman, Heidi Ziegler and Douglas Seale. Yes, my personal attachments have contributed to my position's cause, however, one must always appreciate passion and charisma! Please, do read on:

FCC Chairperson, Michael Powell's, comments were played on the Rush Limbaugh show radio 610 am

today. They were discussing his views and position about media deregulation. What Mr Powell did not address was the necessity of keeping the airwaves free to the American public. He addressed the need to expand and change with the times, but what he did not relay was the impact of deregulation on the smaller networks and on the present-day television companies. Nor how the media would become a monopoly of only the big power groups. He claimed that we have significantly more viewing options now, as the result of hundreds of new television channels, yet, these programs have been made, in great part, on the backbone of the regulations presently established. Corresponding dialogue needs to be voiced to the American people in support of FCC Regulation by its constituents. Mr. Leonard Hill is the government chairperson in support of FCC Regulatory practice and and I strongly feel that such corresponding dialogue is necessary in order to maintain the integrity of a fair debate - and vote.

We live in a time where folks are turned-off by "conservatism" and "liberalism". We've become definition desensitized. We tend to think that deregulation is a favorable term, due to the timing - and the general assumption of its definition. Most folks are acting on a preconception of what it means, instead of finding out "What does deregulation mean?" and then, "What does it mean to me?". Deregulation means a Decrease in the production of quality material by shutting the opportunity for newer, smaller companies to produce material. Deregulation removes the sentinel we call Competition. Deregulation creates a Decrease in Choice. Deregulation closes the door on New Television Companies from ever opening for the first time. Deregulation prevents the Smaller Television Companies in existence from ever having the chance to grow up on their own. Most folks remain devoted to the main television networks for news and entertainment. Therefore, without the FCC Regulations which protect the smaller television companies/networks/newsgroups, entertainment -diversity would not be protected and those large, amoeba-like media companies (Disney, Universal, Time Warner etc) would buy up/out, or essentially eat-up, the smaller television companies. Essentially Deregulation would allow the Larger Companies to take over multiple media groups, therefore having the ability of controlling almost all information relayed to the American people! This means, a big company comprising of one or more movie companies, one or more television companies, one or more radio stations and one or more newspaper companies will have to power to ensure that the SAME NEWS is broadcast on it's network/radio/newspaper everywhere but NOT ensuring the ACCURACY of what is shared That's why competition is necessary.

How would we feel if we went to the grocery store and found only 1 brand of cereal to eat because "All cereal companies are made by the same parent cereal manufacturer" ? Or how would we feel if we went to the furniture store to get a sleepersofa, at "All Sleepersofas are made by The Only Sleepersofa Company"? As an American, this idea is offensive to me. I like choice, I like options and I like knowing that the options are protected for those who produce and/or consume! I like knowing that I can walk into the grocery store and have several hundred brands of different products to try. I like seeing the results of healthy and fair competition. This could be classified as an affirmative action case for the minority television company leaders.

So, if there is only a few cereal manufacturers making all the cereal, where is the competition? OUT the window - along with CHOICE! Lots of folks don't like competition, lots of folks think that competition is unhealthy or causes mental trauma of sorts...but competition is what makes us get up early to go to perform our workday, get dressed in stylish clothes, put on the cheekrouge, eat the healhler brand of bread, make the most sales and earn the most income to support those dearest to us. Competition, to many, is a motivational tool. For without it, we may become lax in making the best product because - if we made the only product - why would we try any harder? Everyone is different and the reason why everyone is different is because we are all made uniquely! We are each our own FCC of sorts, protecting our views, deciding our own thoughts for day's programming, learning/replaying our own news...and we know that without healthy self-imposed regulations, we'd also be failing ourselves!

I like knowing that America protects the integrity of these rights and I like knowing that America sees the necessity of protecting the small, Mom and Pop companies from becoming prey for the big monopolies. FCC Regulations are necessary to protect the means of expression, not simply the product. I thank you kindly for your consideration of my views and I offer my prayers for you and your dear ones, always.

Yours Very Truly,

Blanca E. Degarr-Rizzi
954-444-8797
11012 NW 70th Court
Parkland, FL 33076-3812

The information transmitted is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential, proprietary, and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon, this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from all computers. Copyright (c) 2003. All Rights Reserved.

The information transmitted is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential, proprietary, and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon, this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from all computers. Copyright (c) 2003. All Rights Reserved.

CC: GW Bush public, L Hill, B Degarr

From: Joe Nesbitt
To: Wygb Radio, Sam Donaldson, Rush Limbaugh, Pat Cox, Neal Bortz, Mike Reagan, Matt Drudge, Jim Bohanon, James Grisham, ED Clements, Deborah Pepper, Bill O'Reilly, Sean Hannity, Mark Caesar, Ed Sossen
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 3:12 PM
Subject: Fw: Character Does Matter

----- Original Message -----

From: Henry Pang
To: hannpang@hawaii.rr.com
Sent: Wednesday, May 28, 2003 10:10 PM
Subject: FW: Character Does Matter

Hi,

I just want to share this article with you. It shows the true character of our president. We can all stand proud of his convictions and his beliefs that he is here to serve the Lord. God bless, Henry

WHAT A DIFFERENCE CHARACTER MAKES

Black Tie Black Eye

by Barbara Stanley

One of the things that has always bothered me the most about DC is the railing against each other by day and then going out for a drink together in the evening

How can folks who are diametrically opposed in goals duke it out (like gentlemen for the most part, on the Right side of the aisle), one wanting smaller government and lower taxes, the other, big government and all kinds of social programs, tax and spend democrats and then yuck it up at the local watering hole. It always boggled my mind and it is one of the things about politics that I find so distasteful. This kind of behavior gave rise to the "old-boys club" and "inside the Beltway deals" that are odious to me. How can you really believe in something for hours during the day and then put those strong beliefs away in the evening? I have had a few try to explain this to me and condescendingly at that, that this is "politics" and I'm just some dumb skirt, pat me on the head and I'll go to my sewing.

Every year there is a black tie 'do' in DC that has the president making a few self-deprecating remarks for the press people to gloat about and then some entertainment and everybody goes home laughing. But not this year and not with this president. Hallelujah, I'm a happy camper at last!

While the first speaker, the incoming president of the self-important press folks spoke, the talking in the room, for the most part, still went on. A complete example of how rude most of these self-important reporters are. They couldn't even shut up and listen to their newly installed chief. It was annoying to me to try to listen to this guy as he fumbled to get the audiences attention. It was also embarrassing to watch.

Then George Bush was introduced and the room took on a hush. I could tell they were all waiting for George to let bygones be bygones, swallow the crap he has been getting from them all year and mock himself for their enjoyment.

But, with Helen Thomas, hair all done up and looking spiffy right there on the dais as though she held some kind of special place in the scheme of things, George showed them all what class really looks like.

This was no a joke-fest, like a few years back, with Imus sweating bullets and talking about Bill (The Pig) Clinton's astro-turf in the back of the truck while Bill and Hill glaringly watched. Nope, this was a new day for the lot of them and Bush put them all in their place (at the feeding trough below the bottom rung). I really wish I had taped the thing, so I could watch and listen over and over as the room was so quiet you could hear a pin drop as they sat salivating for the headlines of the articles they would write the next day.

George Bush, freshly victorious in the Liberation of Iraq, was one class act.

He got up, he spoke and his topic was the men who died in Iraq, two of the press' own: Michael Kelly and David Bloom. He commended them for their work; he lauded them for their lives and George finished his remarks, of some length, with the last email that David Bloom sent home to his wife. David told his wife that here he was, in the prime of his career on the eve of his fortieth birthday, in a war zone with the troops as the newly created "embedded" reporter and that all that was really important was her, his wife, their children and Jesus.

Yes, George Bush said the name that has virtually everyone in the press nattering: Jesus. He said it with conviction; he said it with respect and he said it with love. Then he sat down. And the audience sat stunned! I almost couldn't believe my eyes and ears.

It was pure joy to watch the emcee get up, flustered as all get out, trying to fill the gap in time for the band to set up for the entertainment. I only watched a few more minutes before I felt my heart leap with such gratitude that I thought I would cry. Finally a man who stands by his convictions, who cares truly about the previous year and his work during that time, a time of great challenge as France, Germany, Russia, Red China, the United Nations and the press called him out on his decision to liberate Iraq. A year that saw Bill Clinton and Jimmah Carter speak out publicly against Bush, while traveling around as though they were still in charge, dealing with the enemy as the press told us what great peacemakers they were.

Bush is my cowboy and aren't we glad we still have men like him to lead this country. The cowboy is revered by those who understand the true definition of this kind of man; a man slow to anger, never one to pick a fight, always ready to defend the defenseless, a man who has stones and backbone and heart and is willing to go out and face down the badguys, even if it means his own destruction.

For the last year, almost the entire press has slung the arrows at George, has mocked, has ridiculed, has trashed him mercilessly and has done it on an

hourly basis while they pretty much ignored the real hypocrites, to attack the Christian president. They called him stupid, they called him "shrub", they challenged every decision as though they really cared, as though they really understood the full import of the situation and last night George showed them all he has been paying attention and has not forgotten that their actions have caused people to suffer and die more than was absolutely necessary.

Every day in every way, my esteem for this man grows and last night he said what I wanted him to say, he did what I wanted him to do and I will not forget this man is working for me. Thank you, President Bush, from the bottom of my politics-weary heart.

From: Pat Pratt
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, jdelste@fcc.gov
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 3:33 PM
Subject: fcc change of rules re: ownership of media

Dear Commissioners of the Federal Communications Commission:

I am writing to you in opposition to your proposal to allow extended multiple ownership of media. Our country needs a variety of voices able to be heard, not a small collection of radio and TV stations and newspapers all serving up their limited versions of the news. Please continue access to media with a variety of ownerships and viewpoints

Sincerely yours,
Patricia M. Pratt

From: Marilyn A Coffman
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 3:53 PM
Subject: Monopolies

Mr Copps,

I urge you to leave the ownership of radio and TV alone. As a radio talk show listener and a watcher of local TV (I can't afford cable or satellite), I don't get that much variety now.

You don't realize there are a lot of us out here who don't have access to cable and satellite but we do very much depend on the airwaves for news and entertainment. Don't limit us by a decision that does not need to be made.

There is not that much variety as it is now with the media mostly liberal. At least allow some variety in the liberal reporting.

If it ain't broke, don't fix it.

Marilyn A. Coffman

From: Scott Small
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, kimweb@fcc.gov, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 4:28 PM
Subject: Please do not relax market dominance restrictions

The homogenization of the media that occurs as the market is dominated by a small number of players is not in the public interest. Relatively low restrictions are needed on market share to encourage the specialization that will best serve the American public interest. Relaxing market dominance restrictions is not in the public interest.

The detail and diversity needed in news sources for a populace to make informed decisions is degraded by lowest common denominator reportage, feel-good pabulum, and relatively noncontroversial programming. This style of programming is unfortunately rewarded when the number of players in a market is few and the incentive to grow market share is the overarching drive. Rather than focus on serving individual customers well, the market at that scale rewards being least offensive to the greatest number of people. From a microeconomic perspective, the broadcasters are making the strongest decisions to reward their investors. But their customers are not well-served. A sad side effect is that an increasing number of Americans are looking to foreign news sources for the depth and variety of programming that they desire as individuals. Extended, this presents its own risks. Relaxing market dominance restrictions is not in the public interest.

The economic advantages to market dominance are significant. There are distinct areas where economy of scale issues can provide great enough competitive advantage to the larger players that smaller broadcasters are effectively barred from entry to the market. At the point where new entries to the market are shut out, monopolistic abuse is a real risk. Where the number of resulting players is low and the microeconomic incentive toward homogenization is high, overt collusion between market players need not occur, convergence will occur nonetheless, and the consumer will not be the beneficiary of the shift. Relaxing market dominance restrictions is not in the public interest.

American GDP growth and wealth creation over the last fifty years has been driven to a significant degree by an innovative edge that the US has held over other nations. That innovation comes in part by individuals being motivated to develop "disruptive" technologies that dramatically alter the course of an industry in a way that frequently penalizes the previous market leaders as a secondary effect. In a media market where the players are large and few, the media will be less likely to adequately communicate the emergence of disruptive technologies - advertising by the dominant preexisting firms will be the media source of revenues, and an economic incentive to each media company will be present to prevent risk to that revenue stream. This censorship, whether overt at the control of the advertisers or passive will deter some percentage of innovators from establishing ventures that could generate wealth. If the rate of innovation and its reward is diminished even slightly, the long term economic and technological competitiveness of the US will be reduced. Relaxing market dominance restrictions is not in the public interest.

Please do not relax the media market dominance restrictions.

Cordially,
Scott Small

From: Sandra Rudy
To: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, Mike Powell, kjnarveb@fcc.gov, Commissioner Adelstein, Senator Bingaman, Udall: Tom, White House: President
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 4:29 PM
Subject: FCC regulations change

Dear FCC commisioner:

I urge you not to vote June 2 on changes to the FCC regulations. Decisions this important need thorough debate and discussion. Those of us who live in rural America are finding that our choices of media have decreased considerably and it is very difficult to find varying points of view. Our choices of media, particularly the news, have become very one-sided. Narrowing ownership of our media has the potential for only making things worse.

I urge you to postpone your vote and listen to the American people rather than American (and multinational) corporations.

Sincerely,
Sandra Rudy
Alcalde, New Mexico

--- Sandra Rudy
--- ssrudy@earthlink.net

From: sam steel
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 4:48 PM
Subject: Protect the People's Air Waves

To Michael Copps, Member of the FCC. My family and I thank you for standing up and protecting the People's Air Waves! I am sure it has been a difficult challenge, but TRUTH will win out in the long ride! I have sent the message below to Chairmen Powell. Perhaps he fails to read his mail or the opinion of the American People! I will be thinking of you on Monday as the Commission stands for FAIRNESS or CRAWLS into the hands of BIG BUSINESS. Continue success to you! Sincerely, Sam Steel, Columbus, Ohio
Copy below ...

To: Michael Powell, Chairmen of the FCC ... You are a very fortunate man but you have a lot at stake on Monday June 2, 2003! You will be selling out your country, the Public's Trust in the Office you hold, the American People's Air Waves, by allowing a few large corporations to benefit from your involvement with BIG BUSINESS! By reducing the rules and pushing through a vote on secret proposals, you will allow the People's Air Waves to sold out, weaken and you will not protect this country's democracy! SHAME ON YOU if you are so RECKLESS and ARROGANT! I will never vote republican again ... if in fact you allow this tragedy to happen under your watch.

From a sad citizen, Sam Steel, Columbus, Ohio

Add photos to your e-mail with MSN 8. Get 2 months FREE*.

From: Johnmena1@aol.com
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 4:52 PM
Subject: (no subject)

Please do not permit monopoly ownership of news media in the same market. The public does not start to determine the truth in news reporting until being exposed to differing versions of the same story, and that will only happen when differing interests-differing owners are involved.

John P. Gilson
7955 Pebble Brook Ct.
Springfield, VA 22153
(703) 455-7310
johnmena1@aol.com

From: Jim Converse
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 5:03 PM
Subject: My opinion

If they can afford to buy the outlets, let competition rule. Open the doors.

Jim Converse
Shawnee Mission KS USA

From: marcos tovar
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 5:06 PM
Subject: <No Subject>

I am utterly appalled to hear about the FCC's continuing attempts to ease media ownership caps while further relaxing media rules and regulations. My poise as an adversary to the new rules, shared by many Americans, stems from the FCC's ongoing dejection of their fundamental responsibilities. It is my understanding that the FCC is supposed to regulate the airwaves in view of public interest. After all, the airwaves belong to the people, and the FCC should act as the buffer between the people, the government, and the media itself. However, the FCC and Michael Powell seem to interpret public interest as being a responsibility to the media corporations that wish to devour a greater percentage of the market than they already own. In essence, if the FCC gets its way, the new rules set forth will eliminate diversity in the media entirely while giving way too much power to the few people that currently controls our media.

The most disconcerting consequence that will result with the passage of the broadcast ownership Biennial Review is the deterioration of diverse sources of information. I am a firm believer of information being passed, and I genuinely believe that Diversity in the media is enormously important to our democracy. If the FCC is successful in its attempt to undercut this diversity, the new rules will do a disservice to all Americans. As citizens and consumers, Americans should have choices in the music they hear and the television programs they watch while also having access to several different points of view not 5 points of view broadcasted through 1000s of outlets. All Americans can appreciate the importance of having multiple sources of diverse information. The government and the FCC's primary responsibility should be fostering this diversity of expression; consequently, the FCC's new rules are likely to undermine it by allowing one company to own several stations that transmit the same message.

Equally disturbing, as it is now, five or six media companies control 75 to 80 percent of Americans' media consumption. The current rules state that one company can not own more than 35% of the market as far as the number of stations owned; however, technically speaking mainstream media companies do own more than 35% of the market because in some areas they control as much as 80% of the listening/viewing audience. If the rules were to be further relaxed and corporations were able to purchase and consolidate more, then these same companies would be able to manipulate an even greater percentage of that audience. This means that just a few companies will control everything we see and hear which will essentially allow them to mold entirely public concern as well as public interest. Now that's disturbing!

I am quite certain that I am not the only American that suspects of these efforts to change. In my case however, suspicion is more welcome than the uninformed sleep-walk toward further consolidation that will leave the powerful American media in the hands of a few powerful men. In Michael Powell's case, he is only interested in seeing huge corporations increase profits versus seeing smaller companies owned by individuals prosper. Media ownership rules are intended to protect and advance the values of diversity, localism and competition and should remain unabated.

Thank you for your time,
Marcos Tovar

Do you Yahoo!?
Yahoo! Calendar - Free online calendar with sync to Outlook(TM).
<http://calendar.yahoo.com>

From: Kenneth Jefferson Cottrell
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 5:09 PM
Subject: I'm deeply concerned about your latest initiatives

Sirs and madam.

I'm writing in the hopes that I can influence you to stop any further dismantling of and exceptions from the laws currently in place that encourage diverse and wide ownership of the media in the United States. My concerns are these:

1. While I have no intention of telling other people what to think or read, it is important to me that I have access to a wide variety of opinions and sources of information. This is essential for a healthy democracy.
2. I think that it is in the best interests of the country that we DISCOURAGE the trend toward consolidation of these important resources so that their policy is not set by a few corporate giants (who will not be inclined to report on their own legal and ethical transgressions).
3. To those of those companies that say that the business environment has changed such that it's harder to make a profit in broadcast and print media, I say that, as a worker in the high-tech sector, my job is in growing danger. But we have to adapt to changing conditions or else find another source of income. They are not guaranteed a profit.
4. In my lifetime (I'm turning 54 this month), I've seen a rapid homogenization of our culture. The regional charm of dress, cuisine, music, dialect, etc. that has made our national fabric so rich is becoming gentrified. These initiatives under consideration would further encourage that trend.
5. Waivers that have been granted in the last decade have allowed for the foreign ownership of a major network in the United States (Fox) and the emergence of a broadcasting powerhouse that has more political agenda than public interest at heart (Clear Channel). We've already gone too far.

This is one of the most important issues in our country today and I hope you think long and hard before you further dismantle those safeguards that prevent exactly what you seem to be so eager to achieve. Thanks for your attention.

Kenneth Jefferson Cottrell
1903 Utopia Court
Austin, Texas 78723-1937

From: Steve Probst
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 5:37 PM
Subject: <No Subject>

Do not change the ownership rules for media companies. Diverse ownership is vital to getting good unbiased news coverage.

Steve Probst
405 Stuntz Ave.
Ashland, WI 54806

From: Bobby White
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 5:41 PM
Subject: <No Subject>

Dear Chairman and Commissioners,

I used to work for a foreign media conglomerate called the Fuji Sankei Media Group of Japan, a company consisting of TV broadcasting, print, and radio, in the early eighties specifically because anti-trust laws precluded American media companies from such formations and I wanted experience in the upcoming era of new media. As a result, I a voting American, can attest and report to you from experience, that the new media ownership law you're pushing for the first week of June '03 will in fact pull our public away from being fully and efficiently informed. The Constitution empowers a free press for the purposes of "an informed public", so your decisions have to prioritize that.

I feel that you are working for the interests of President Bush's cronies rather than the public interest. That you've strayed from your responsibility and are concerned about issues that are for the Commerce Commission.

Sincerely,

Bobby White
8530 Holloway Dr. #108
West Hollywood, CA 90069

(310) 652-0981

CC: senator@boxer.senate.gov, senator@feinstein.senate.gov

From: Steve and Kaye Tanner
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, Martin:kjmweb@fcc.gov, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 5:56 PM
Subject: <No Subject>

Chairman Michael K. Powell
Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy
Commissioner Michael J. Copps
Commissioner Kevin J. Martin
Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein

Dear Commissioners,

This is to register my opposition to the proposal to relax media ownership rules that is to be decided upon this June 2nd. I consider this to be clearly against the interests of an informed populace. Criticism is the best antidote against error. History has shown that our great nation is not immune to that. Ownership concentration will restrict the availability of voices that address public policy issues, reducing the likelihood that important critical viewpoints will be heard.

I am clearly aware of the economic benefits of a free market, but the marketplace of ideas is not an economic one. This issue clearly pits the informed interests of the people against both the propaganda interests of the state and the economic interests of large, establishmentarian corporations that are all too often willing to go along with the official line.

It is not likely that all of your descendents will enjoy positions of priveledge such as the ones you do now. They, like the rest of us, will inherit the long-term consequences of your decision. Please carefully consider exactly who you represent before deciding on this issue. Your decision will clearly indicate whose side you are on.

Respectfully,

Steve Tanner
36281 Middle Ridge Dr.
Lebanon, OR 97355
stanner@dswebnet.com

CC: Steve and Kaye Tanner

From: Wayne & Barbara Derrick
To: Mike Powell, kabernath@fcc.gov, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, jadelstc@fcc.gov
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 6:20 PM
Subject: Against-proposal to allow more broadcast stations per company

To the Commissioners:

In Houston, TX the multiple ownership of radio stations by one company is already evidence that we are losing diversity. An all news station regularly diverts to covering sporting events; an all pleasant music AM station also diverts to sporting events,

At home, the news broadcasts already are so related to increasing market share, that we have switched to watching BBC World News and Newshour with Lehar instead of commercial stations. In the car, we are more often unable to find programming we like so we are listening to more CD's.

The combination of increasing percentage of commercial time, plus a programming wasteland is what is wrong with the broadcast media, and further consolidation is going to make things worse for the public.

The lack of profitability of some broadcast stations is substantially due to paying too much money for rights to carry sporting events, and failure to carry quality programs [in an effort to gain market share.

I have a suggestion that the broadcast stations pay a licensing fee of 10% of gross income for the right to keep their channels.

Thanks for reading this,
Wayne Derrick, 12406 Pinerock Ln, Houston, TX 77024
713.464.8877

From: Curtis Fletcher
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 7:14 PM
Subject: 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review

Please register my complaint that the FCC should not under any circumstances allow companies to own a larger share of local or national markets in the communication industry. As fewer companies take a larger share of the marketplace, we the people have less reliable and unbiased news and information to choose from.

Sincerely your,

Curtis Fletcher

Castro Valley, Ca.

From: Sam Sullivan
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 9:52 PM
Subject: Pleasedo not change present regulations

Dear Chairman Powell:

Please leave the rules as is--we want to hear differing viewpoints, not enrich a few companies that will control all the media outlets!

Thank you,
Sam Sullivan

Add photos to your messages with MSN 8. Get 2 months FREE*.
<http://join.msn.com/?page=features/featuredemail>

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: Sid Davis
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 10:09 PM
Subject: <No Subject>

Dear Chairman Powell and Commissioners Abernathy, Copps, Martin and Adelstein,

I hope it is not too late to seek a delay or to stop the proposal to lift ownership restrictions in broadcasting.

I am a former Vice President and Washington Bureau Chief of NBC News and a former White House Correspondent and Washington Bureau Chief of Westinghouse Broadcasting Company (Group W).

I spent 18 years with Westinghouse through the sixties and seventies. We owned the limit of stations then, five TV and seven radio. We had a Washington news bureau staff of seventeen, a bureau chief, a deputy, seven correspondents, a commentator, three techs, and two clerical people. We had a multiple person news center in London and bureaus in Rome, Paris, Saigon, Vienna, and stringers in Moscow, Tokyo and elsewhere. We had 24 hour circuits to our stations. We covered all important presidential speeches and news conferences live. That was policy. Each of our stations had large local news departments. We did all that with only five TV's and seven radios! And we made good money too.

I would venture a guess that few, if any, of the mammoth radio conglomerates today, some with hundreds, even as many as 1200 stations, has its own news bureau in Washington and elsewhere. Most don't have meaningful local news departments. These giants operate on the "rent a reporter" principle because it is cheap. They are, in effect, outsourcing responsibility. This is not diversity. It is a flagrant trashing of obligations once held dear by responsible broadcasters who pledged to serve the public interest, convenience and necessity, in return for a license. Since the flood gates of ownership were opened in 1996, radio and television quality has not improved. Radio has become a cacophonous, open drainage ditch, broadcasting only what can sell. That is not the use Americans and the broadcasting pioneers expected from an industry with such great potential to inform and educate.

The concentration of media power in a handful of owners will further limit what we see and hear because the conglomerates are cheaping out on news. "The public interest, convenience and necessity" is a rarely heard expression in those quarters. Local broadcasting is being swallowed by the bargain basement economics of centrally dictated programming. Americans will be sorted out into One Company Media Towns hooked to a program director in a distant place who knows nothing of the local culture or its problems. We Americans used to brag about having news media that were not controlled by the hands of a few. We once considered that dangerous, incompatible with democracy. Removing the ownership restrictions surely will make money. But it has not and will not make broadcasting better. It is bad news. It's wrong.

Sincerely,

Sid Davis

From: Mark Gilman
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, kjmweb@fcc.gov, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 11:01 PM
Subject: MM Docket 01-235 and MM Docket 01-317

Federal Communication Commission

Dear Chairman Powell,

I am very concerned about issues the FCC will be voting on, on Monday June 2, 2003, especially those rules dealing with the Cross Ownership of Broadcast Stations and Newspapers (MM Docket No. 01-235) and Rules and Policies Concerning Multiple Ownership of Radio Broadcast Stations in Local Markets (MM Docket No. 01-317).

I believe that if you approve Cross Ownership and Multiple Ownership, that will lead to further consolidation of what news Americans will be exposed to.

In a democracy, the people should have access to many diverse sources of information. The trend toward consolidation, in my opinion, is very restrictive and contrary to the rights and freedoms guaranteed to the American people by our constitution. Also, because of limited access to information that already exists, I believe there has not been sufficient public education about these issues, nor has there been sufficient opportunity for public input.

- 1) Please delay your vote on these very important issues for at least one month.
- 2) Please do not allow further consolidation of the media. I do not think Cross Ownership or Multiple Ownership will promote either competition or diversity.
- 3) Please remember who you are suppose to represent, the American People.

Sincerely,

Liz Wirth
551 W. Cordova Road
Santa Fe, NM 87505

From: Mckinneyhunter@aol.com
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 11:21 PM
Subject: (no subject)

Please consider the people that work within the broadcasting industry when you make your decisions. Please don't sell the FCC to big business. They are greedy, and do not care about people, not even their own people.